

87 01300

✓ 6/25/8

---

# Center for Analysis and Information Services

## Jobs / Housing Balance For Traffic Mitigation

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL  
STUDIES LIBRARY

JUN 17 1987

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA



Association of Bay Area Governments

---

P.O. Box 2050  
Oakland, CA 94604  
(415) 464-7900

---

MetroCenter  
8th and Oak Streets  
Oakland



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2024

<https://archive.org/details/C124890136>

**JOBS/HOUSING BALANCE  
FOR  
TRAFFIC MITIGATION**

**Interstate 680 and Interstate 580**

**Corridor Study**

**November 1985**

**ABAG**

**Association of Bay Area Governments**





## CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
II.	JOBS HOUSING BALANCE. . . . .	3
III.	ANALYSIS OF JOBS/HOUSING RELATIONSHIPS--I 680/I 580 CORRIDOR	5
	A. Data Sources . . . . .	5
	B. I 680/I 580 Corridor Study Area Analysis . . . . .	6
IV.	IMPROVING THE INFORMATION BASE FOR LOCAL DECISION MAKING .	8
	A. Development of an Affordable Housing Model . . . . .	8
	B. Applications of the Model and Analysis . . . . .	10
	Findings: Route 101 Peninsula Study	10
	I 680/I 580 Corridor Study . . . . .	11
	C. Identifying the Potential for Employing Local	
	Residents. . . . .	12
	Attracting Resident Workers to Jobs	
	Nearer Their Homes. . . . .	13
	Attracting New Workers to the Labor	
	Force . . . . .	13
	Matching Job Opportunities with Job	
	Requirements. . . . .	14
V.	INVENTORY OF TRAFFIC MITIGATION MEASURES	15
	1. Measures to Increase the Supply of Housing Close	
	to Employment Centers. . . . .	17
	2. Measures to Encourage Production of Affordable	
	Housing. . . . .	18
	3. Measures to Phase Housing Construction with Job	
	Growth . . . . .	19
	4. Measures to Improve Access to Transit for Home-to-	
	Work Trips . . . . .	19
	5. Measures to Encourage Developers to Locate Where	
	Affordable Housing is Available. . . . .	19
	6. Measures to Increase Employment of Local Residents	
	in the New Jobs. . . . .	20
VI.	REFERENCES . . . . .	22
	A. AFFORDABLE HOUSING DEMAND MODEL--Application to	
	I 680 /I 580 Corridor Communities	
	- Salary Levels of Projected New Workers, 1985-1995	
	- Household Income Distribution of Projected New	
	Workers	
	B. SUMMARIES OF HOUSING/JOBS MITIGATION MEASURES SURVEYS	
	- Route 101 Peninsula Corridor	
	- I 680/ I 580 Corridor	
	C. EMPLOYING LOCAL RESIDENTS IN THE NEW JOBS	





## I. INTRODUCTION

This report has been prepared for use in conjunction with MTC's recently issued Traffic Mitigation Reference Guide. The mitigation measures in the final chapter present a broad range of actions available to local governments, developers, employers, public and private economic development agencies and educational institutions. Combined to respond to local conditions, these measures can reduce trip generation and commute distances by bringing housing and jobs closer together and into better numerical balance in subregional areas. They are measures already in use in Bay Area communities and elsewhere in California and the United States. The list has been developed through research and analysis, questionnaires and discussions with communities participating in the Interstate 680/Interstate 580 Corridor Study, the Route 101 Corridor Study and the East Bay North Study.

The premise underlying ABAG's work in these studies is that additional relief of pressure on freeways and arterials can be achieved when jobs are filled by people who can use local streets to walk, bicycle, carpool, or take transit to work.

It is important to note that each of the studies from which the recommendations were developed was conducted in transportation corridors, with involvement of many cities and counties. Impacts of new employment growth on housing demand have been examined on a subregional basis, as have the potentials for increasing housing supply and for employment of local residents. Single jurisdictions cannot solve traffic problems that are the result of cumulative development decisions in many communities. Both the potential for affordable housing and the structure of the available labor pool vary from community to community. A subregional strategy will have to encompass a mix of mitigating measures in each community, tailored to local conditions, but combined so that they complement each other in the common objective of reducing long commutes and relieving traffic congestion. Cooperation and trade-offs among jurisdictions will be necessary.

Even a comprehensive strategy that combines transportation improvements and transportation systems management efforts with actions to create a better match between housing and jobs will not produce an "instant answer" to traffic congestion. A coordinated effort among all the communities in a subregional area, implementing a set of measures that attacks the problem from every possible angle, however, can expect to achieve incremental results in the short-term and measurable results over the long run. In the I 680/I 580 Corridor subarea, the momentum of development has been so great and the imbalance between jobs and affordable housing is already so critical, that even in the long-term, the study area will continue to see substantial commuting from areas outside the Bay Area, as well as from other parts of the region.

The report begins, in Chapter II, with a definition of "Jobs/Housing Balance" and a general statement of the problem in the Bay Area.

Chapter III describes a process for analyzing jobs/housing relationships in a corridor or subregional area with severe traffic problems. For illustration, the nature and causes of imbalance in the I 680/I 580 Corridor are identified. The analysis reveals two major gaps in the information base needed by local decision makers in choosing appropriate mitigations for jobs/housing imbalances. Chapter IV describes methods developed by ABAG, using available data sources, for estimating (1) housing market impacts of proposed job growth in subregional areas--the magnitude of the affordable housing demand, and (2) the potential for maximizing employment of local residents in the new jobs.

Chapter V contains a comprehensive set of mitigating actions for balancing housing and jobs to relieve traffic congestion, for consideration by local elected officials and the private sector. The actions range from measures to increase the supply of housing affordable to new workers, to phasing housing production with job growth, to matching the resident labor pool with the new jobs.

The conclusions of this report will be the basis for a proposed amendment to ABAG's Regional Plan concerning subregional strategies for coordinated planning for economic growth, housing and transportation.



## II. JOBS/HOUSING BALANCE

The California Department of Housing and Community Development (in 101 Steps to Better Housing, draft, September 1982), states that:

A jobs/housing balance occurs if people live in housing that is affordable at the wages they earn, and travel minimum distances to their jobs and the services they use. In a well planned community or region, attaining a jobs/housing balance primarily involves: relating projected household costs to projected household incomes; ensuring an adequate supply of land zoned for residential use at densities that will facilitate the affordable housing; and making sure there are adequate public and private services needed by the population. In a "balanced community" the housing units are also available for occupancy at the same time the new jobs are created. Measures to assure the affordability of the housing over time will preserve this balance. All these factors should be present within a commuting radius that effectively uses public and private transportation resources and preserves air quality.

Economic growth that has far outpaced housing production has created monumental problems for the Bay Area's transportation system. While considerable attention has been given to the need for highway and transit improvements, only recently have local and regional planners begun to consider strategies that reduce traffic congestion on freeways and local streets by balancing housing and jobs in areas experiencing rapid growth.

In general, local governments, here and elsewhere in the United States, are trying measures that:

- increase housing densities in areas in proximity to job centers and along transit routes;
- encourage mixed-use development: residential/commercial or industrial/commercial;
- require developers of large-scale office, commercial or industrial projects to provide new housing, on- or off-site, or contribute to a city's housing production or loan funds;
- limit job growth in new employment centers or phase job growth with housing development;
- encourage developers to locate new commercial/industrial development in areas where moderate income housing is available or has been approved; and
- require hiring agreements that offer local residents first priority in new job opportunities as a condition of public assistance.

Most communities using such measures have adopted them to meet housing and economic development objectives. There has been little analysis of how local governments can work together to link new jobs, additional housing and the resident labor pool in a systematic way to help attain local and regional transportation and environmental objectives.

### III. ANALYSIS OF JOBS/HOUSING RELATIONSHIPS, CURRENT AND PROJECTED -- I 680/I 580 CORRIDOR

Before choosing appropriate mitigation measures, local governments need to determine the degree of imbalance and the extent to which it contributes to traffic problems. Freeway and arterial congestion are not confined to single communities but affect many jurisdictions along major transportation routes. Analysis of relationships and conditions in transportation corridors helps focus on problem areas. It also brings to light the kinds of additional information local decision makers will need to determine how best to respond, individually and cooperatively, to the overall problem.

#### A. Data Sources

This analysis draws primarily upon the 1982 and 1984 updates of ABAG's Local Development Policy Survey and the 1983 and 1985 Projections of population, employment and households.

Every two years, ABAG updates its projections of population, employment and households -- for the region, for the nine counties, and for each city and major unincorporated area within each county. Prior to development of a new series of projections, ABAG updates its survey of local development policies and recently approved major development projects. Planners for each city and county provide information on land available for development:

- how much
- whether it is zoned for residential, industrial/commercial or mixed uses
- densities
- planned phasing of development.

City, county and special district planners also provide information on existing and planned infrastructure capacity, such as for:

- water supply
- sewage treatment and effluent disposal
- freeways and roads
- schools.

Local governments' plans, policies and regulations are among the key assumptions ABAG uses in developing the projections. In forecasting the likely outcomes of existing local growth policies over 20 years, the projections assume that needed infrastructure will be available to serve the growth as it occurs. In some cases, policy changes to increase housing potential are also assumed.

**Projections '83** -- for the period 1980 to 2000 -- includes the following information for each city, major incorporated area, or county remainder, as well as county totals for the nine Bay Area counties:

- total population
- household population



- total households
- total employment
- employment by major industrial categories (agricultural and mining, manufacturing and wholesale, retail, services, and other).

**Projections '85--** for 1980 to 2005 -- has additional tables showing:

- employed residents
- mean household income.

## **B. I 680/I 580 Corridor Study Area Analysis**

The study area includes central and eastern Contra Costa County and the Pleasanton-Livermore area of Alameda County. The transportation system and surrounding communities were divided into five corridor segments:

- The highway 4 corridor from I 680 to Antioch, including Pittsburg, Antioch, Brentwood and rural East Contra Costa County.
- The north central I 680 corridor from the Benicia-Martinez Bridge to the I 680/Hwy 24 interchange, including Martinez, Concord, Clayton, Pleasant Hill and Walnut Creek.
- The Hwy 24 corridor west of I 680, including Moraga, Lafayette and Orinda.
- The south central I 680 corridor from Hwy 24 to the Contra Costa-Alameda County line, including Danville, Alamo, San Ramon and the unincorporated areas of the San Ramon Valley.
- The south I 680 corridor including I 580 to Livermore, and Dublin, Pleasanton and Livermore.

For the study area, Projections '83 forecast 150,000 new jobs and nearly 103,000 additional households over the next 20 years. The 1982 Local Policy Survey update showed a residentially zoned land supply that could potentially accommodate 118,000 dwelling units; more than sufficient to meet the demand associated with projected job growth. At that time the major concern was whether public services necessary to support this growth would be available, especially sewage treatment and transportation facilities.

By 1984, when the Local Policy Survey was again updated to begin preparing Projections '85, the overall picture had changed markedly. In the intervening two years, increases in residential densities and lands zoned for residential use, in particular in the San Ramon/Livermore/Amador Valleys and in eastern Contra Costa County, had raised the ultimate dwelling unit potential for the entire study area to about 132,000. In the same two-year period, however, there were also changes in local policies encouraging growth. A number of very large employment-generating projects were approved. The result was a projected job potential by the turn of the century that would surpass the dwelling unit potential of current local

plans and zoning. Projections '85, just released, estimates 135,000 new households in the study area associated with a job growth of about 220,000 between 1980 and 2005.

Thus, to the constraints threatening economic growth foreseen in the 1983 projections -- inadequate sewage treatment and transportation facilities -- has been added a housing supply that is not keeping pace with anticipated job growth.

In addition to the imbalance in numbers alone, both the location of the housing that is being built relative to major job growth centers, and the prices of much of that housing in relation to the salaries of prospective new workers, contribute further to traffic problems in the study area. While jobs are going to the central and southern parts of the corridor study area, the growth in population and affordable housing is occurring in the Cities of Antioch, Brentwood, Pittsburg, and rural East Contra Costa County. Nearly thirty-five percent of the anticipated population increase between 1985-1990 will occur in these communities which expect to capture only 10% of the study area's estimated job growth during that period.

Another important factor straining the transportation system is the ratio of total employment to employed residents. In 1980, there were about 179,000 jobs and 272,000 employed residents in the study area, for a jobs/employed residents ratio of .66. Over 90,000 employees commuted to another county to work, either within or outside the study area. Projections '85 estimates the ratio rising to .79 by 2005. For Contra Costa County as a whole, the projections document shows a jobs/employed residents ratio of .68 in 1985 and of .72 in 2005. While this ratio is increasing slowly, what we are seeing is a continuing, substantial number of workers commuting to job centers outside the study area. Freeways are congested in both directions during morning and evening peaks.

The analysis suggests that, if the jobs/housing balance in the study area is to be improved to reduce long commutes, actions are needed to:

- produce more housing closer to job centers,
- produce more housing that is affordable at the salaries earned by workers in the new jobs,
- encourage location of job-producing uses in communities where affordable housing is available and highway connections to major employment centers are deficient, and
- increase the number of study area residents who are employed in the new jobs being created.

#### IV. IMPROVING THE INFORMATION BASE FOR LOCAL DECISION MAKING

A survey of measures designed to bring housing and jobs closer together was conducted among the communities participating in both the I 680/I 580 and the Route 101 Peninsula Corridor Studies. In all, 33 cities and four counties completed a questionnaire about their use of measures concerning:

- the location of residential development
- housing affordability
- facilitating the housing/transit/work/connection
- phasing housing construction with job growth
- employing local residents.

Responses to the questionnaire (see Appendix B) indicated that, primarily because of Housing Element and other statutory requirements, many Bay Area communities have adopted measures to increase the supply of housing close to employment centers and to encourage production of moderate income housing. Few jurisdictions, however, in approving proposed projects, have had information available about incomes of prospective workers that would enable them to match the type of housing that is being approved to the ability of new workers to afford it.

The survey also revealed that measures to maximize employment of local residents -- those now commuting out, new entrants or reentrants to the work force, and local unemployed or underemployed workers -- were virtually untried.

To date, very little information has been made available to local decision makers about the new jobs that a proposed development will bring--other than a total number estimated on a workers-per-square-foot or per-acre basis. Environmental assessments rarely attempt to examine the impacts of large-scale economic development on either the local housing market or the labor market.

To produce new housing, affordable to workers in new jobs, decision makers need to know the income levels of the new workers' households; to design courses to help local residents obtain appropriate skills, schools and colleges, Private Industry Councils, economic development and redevelopment agencies need to know what skills the new jobs will require.

##### A. Development of An Affordable Housing Demand Model

Through their authority to control type, density, location, and timing of new economic and residential development, and to require mitigation of significant adverse impacts in the environmental review and permit approval process, local decision makers have the ability to ensure a better match between workers' incomes and new housing. They can only do this, however, if they have sufficient information to estimate the magnitude of the demand for housing at various income levels that will result from the



job growth. The demand can then be considered along with local factors: what housing is available, vacancy rates, prices of sale and rental housing, regional housing needs allocations, available land, existing affordable housing policies and implementing actions, and how estimated needs of new workers moving into the area compare with housing currently available or planned in nearby communities.

Because much of the new development is speculative, both developers and planners have not believed that specific job-type and salary information could be available at the project approval stage. However, with the objective of a better jobs/housing balance at a subregional or corridor level, there are data sources that can be used to develop a model for estimating the probable cumulative impacts of proposed job growth on the housing market.

The first step in developing such a model is to identify the types and sources of information needed:

- the total projected number of new jobs in the corridor or subregion;
- the relevant industrial sectors and/or occupational categories for proposed office, commercial, light industrial, hotel and restaurant development;
- income data associated with the industrial sectors and occupational categories; and workers-per-household patterns by income levels in the study area.

In the Route 101 Peninsula Study, environmental documents for proposed projects in the San Mateo County portion of the study area were used to arrive at a total number of new jobs. The technical advisory committee of local planners for that study recommended that employment figures from ABAG's Projections '83 be used in future applications. They were considered to be more reliable than aggregated figures from proposed projects, some of which may be changed in scale, delayed or not built. Accordingly, the ABAG projections were used in the I 680/I 580 Study and current projections will be used hereafter.

Projected jobs in the study area were divided into industrial sectors using the classification system in ABAG's regional modeling system. Wage and salary income data from the 1980 Census Public Use Microdata Sample were used along with forecasts of employment by industrial sector from Projections '83 to predict new workers' income levels.

Information about workers-per-household patterns by income levels from the 1980 Census Public Use Microdata Sample was then used to estimate numbers of new households by income levels. Finally, these numbers were compared with the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's housing income levels to estimate the subregional housing demand at the four HUD levels. (See Appendix B for memoranda detailing application of the model to the I 680/I 580 Corridor Study area.)

Although the subregional housing demand at various income levels can only be roughly estimated, the model provides better information than local decision makers have had to date. It is not precise enough to achieve balance at the project or community level, but is a useful tool for looking at cumulative impacts. It points to the need for cooperation among jurisdictions within subregional areas to provide the housing and infrastructure needed to sustain their common economic growth and mitigate the traffic congestion they all share.

## **B. Applications of the Model and Analysis**

As noted above, the affordable housing demand model was applied to the communities in both the Rte 101 Peninsula and I 680/I 580 corridors.

### **Findings: Route 101 Peninsula Study**

1. If all of the projects are completed as proposed, an estimated 101,500 new jobs will be created in San Mateo County.
2. About 85% of the new jobs would have salaries at "moderate housing income" levels or below, in 1979 dollars, as set by HUD and used in ABAG's Regional Housing Needs Determinations, 1983.
3. Given the model's assumption of existing workers-per-household patterns in San Mateo County (1980), the 101,500 new jobs would create a potential demand for 69,000 additional housing units in the San Mateo County communities.
4. Of the 69,000 potential new households, an estimated 64% would have household incomes at "moderate housing income" levels or below.
5. ABAG's Local Policy Survey of 1982 shows a 1980-2000 potential of 28,000 new units, given land identified as available and zoned for residential development. Many cities will be "built out" by the 1990s, with additional housing possible only in redevelopment areas.
6. In the San Mateo communities, new housing can reduce traffic congestion and long commutes if it brings housing and jobs closer together. A strategy for communities in this corridor should include measures that:
  - ensure that new housing that is approved will be available at prices that will enable new workers to move into the corridor as residents;
  - encourage slight increases in density in existing neighborhoods;
  - improve access to transit for home-to-work trips within the corridor, in particular for trips from west of Rte. 101 to the Bayside; and

- maximize employment of existing residents in the new job centers.

### Findings: I 680/I 580 Corridor Study

1. Approximately 84,900 new jobs are projected for the study area between 1985 and 1995.
2. In 1979 dollars, an estimated 79% of the new jobs would have wage and salary incomes below \$25,000; 94% below \$40,000.
3. The 84,900 new jobs are estimated to represent 54,300 new households.
4. As of August 1984, HUD estimated that the median household income for the 5-county Bay area was \$34,000. Households with an income of less than 120% of median income were classified as "moderate housing income or less." When the 1979 income levels for the study area were adjusted to 1984 dollars, about 70% of the 54,300 estimated new households would have a moderate or lower housing income. Assuming that a household could afford to own housing no more expensive than three times its wage and salary income, about 38,000 new households would need housing costing less than \$125,000.

#### HUD HOUSING INCOME LEVELS - 1984 - Median Income - \$34,000

<u>Income Level</u>	<u>% of Median</u>	<u>Income Range</u>
Very Low	up to 50%	under \$17,000
Low	50% to 80%	\$17,001 to \$27,200
Moderate	81% to 120%	\$27,201 to \$40,800
Above Moderate	above 120%	\$40,801 and above

5. In contrast to the San Mateo Corridor communities, most communities in the I 680/I 580 corridor have sufficient residentially planned land available for development to meet the projected household growth. Here the issues are density, affordability and location within the study area. For most communities, residential acreage is zoned for low-density, single-family dwellings. Housing that is being produced near employment growth centers is primarily affordable only at "Above Moderate" income levels. Most of the growth in moderate-priced housing is in eastern Contra Costa County, while the job growth is concentrated in the central county and Tri-Valley areas.
6. Housing/jobs balance strategies for communities in this corridor should combine measures that:
  - increase the supply of moderate income housing near job centers;



- encourage industrial and commercial development in communities with existing moderate income housing;
- improve access to transit for home-to-work trips within the study area; and
- maximize employment of existing residents in the new jobs.

While the model makes a number of assumptions about the continuation of existing workers-per-household and household income patterns, and the estimates are rough and deliberately conservative, it provides -- for the first time -- a look at the magnitude of the impact of the proposed job growth for the housing and labor markets in a subregional area, and not solely at the impacts on the transportation system. The information can be used by local planners and decision makers to vary the mix, densities and locations of new residential projects, thereby enabling new workers to live closer to their jobs.

### **C. Identifying the Potential for Employing Local Residents**

Many developers have cited the availability of a labor pool as an important factor in their decision to locate in an area. Not only can they more easily find workers, but their project's cost may be less if decreased commuting by area residents reduces the need for privately funded traffic improvements.

Other than transportation systems management (TSM) and street improvements, developers/employers have available two principal approaches to mitigating traffic problems. First, they can hire workers living in, but now commuting outside the subregion. Second, they can encourage area residents who are not now employed, to enter or reenter the labor force. Using information from the 1980 Census and Projections 85, our analysis of the I 680/I 580 subregion indicates the following:

- o In general, local residents filling the new jobs will probably be existing residents now commuting out rather than workers new to or reentering the labor force. Employers interested in attracting residents who commute out should consider concentrating on lower income workers (those now earning under \$25,000 per year). Those employees with lower incomes may place a higher value on working close to home, since their commuting costs are a higher percentage of their income.
- o Employers wanting to hire residents who are not in the labor force, should focus their efforts on: 1) women who do not work, or who only work part-time, 2) men in lower income jobs, and 3) the unemployed.
- o Community colleges, private industry councils, and job training centers can increase the employment of study area residents in nearby job opportunities by providing training, retraining and

"refresher" courses, geared to the occupational requirements of the new developments and aimed at the groups identified above.

## **1. Attracting Resident Workers to Jobs Nearer Their Homes**

Study area employers should successfully attract area residents now commuting out because longer commutes have higher costs and, hence, result in lower disposable income. In 1980, thirty-four percent of study area residents (over 90,000 workers) commuted to jobs outside the county they lived in. This was significantly higher than the region where only twenty-three percent of the residents work outside the county of residence.

Comparing the income distribution of Contra Costa County residents who commute outside the county, to those who worked in the county, indicates that the propensity to commute is related to income and, perhaps, hours worked per week. Sixty-one percent of high income workers (over \$50,000 per year) commute out of the county. However, only 25 percent of workers earning less than \$10,000 work outside the county. Thirty-five percent of the commuters earned \$25,000 or less in 1980. As noted earlier, between 70% and 80% of the estimated new jobs expected in the county, were in this salary range in 1979 dollars.

## **2. Attracting New Workers to the Labor Force**

As stated above, traffic impacts of new job-producing development can be reduced not only by attracting resident workers to jobs nearer their homes, but also by hiring residents who are not currently working. Frequently, new workers can be drawn from several groups, including women, students, the underemployed and the unemployed.

Examination of the 1980 Census data on the I 680/I 580 area indicates that, as in other areas, women were more likely than men and college students to increase their labor force participation. Compared to Bay Area figures, fewer women, aged 16 to 64 worked (58% compared to 62% for the region). Even fewer worked full-time (48% compared to 77% for the Bay Area as a whole). In addition, 55% of women with children under six were not in the labor force (the regional figure is 50%). This indicates more women staying home with young children. Study area employers are already beginning to provide day care facilities and assistance in an effort to attract these potential employees.

On the other hand, college-age students living in the area were more likely to be working than other such Bay Area students.

Some indirect evidence of "underemployment" was found indicating that potential does exist for redirecting area residents to jobs nearer their homes. Because of higher education levels than in the rest of the region, the high percentage of part-time workers among women, and

data showing that approximately 60% of the workers had incomes below \$15,000 (including part-time), it can be assumed that, in order to avoid commuting, a significant number of these low-income workers choose to work at jobs that do not use their full capabilities.

Although unemployment was actually lower in the study area in 1980 (4%) than in the region (5%), these workers should be considered when evaluating any potential for increased hiring of local residents. And with transit improvements between the corridor and West Contra Costa County, new jobs in the study area could help relieve unemployment in Richmond.

### **3. Matching Training Opportunities with Job Requirements**

Training, retraining and "brush-up" opportunities will be needed to increase the employment of local residents in the new jobs. ABAG studies indicate that 28% of the 78,000 projected new job opportunities between 1980 and 1990 in Contra Costa County (data for the study area are not available) will be managerial and professional occupations. Another 42% will be technical, sales, and clerical positions, and the remaining 30% of new jobs will be in service, production, craft, and unskilled occupations. At the same time shifts are occurring in the occupational structure in the study area. Blue collar jobs are declining in north central Contra Costa County.

If local job training and adult education programs are aware of corridor employers' specific requirements, they can structure their courses to the changing job mix described above. Not only would this increase opportunities for area residents, but it could also help reduce long-term traffic impacts of new development.



## **V. INVENTORY OF TRAFFIC MITIGATION MEASURES**

This section describes six types of actions that local governments can combine into strategies to reduce the number and length of commute trips on adjacent freeways. They include measures, currently in use in many areas, to:

1. Increase the supply of housing close to employment centers;
2. Encourage production of affordable housing;
3. Phase housing construction with job growth;
4. Improve access to transit for home-to-work trips;
5. Encourage developers to locate near existing affordable housing;  
and,
6. Increase employment of local residents in the new jobs.

The combination of actions that could make up a strategy will vary from city to city depending upon local and subregional conditions.

In considering these measures, local planners and decision makers should keep several points in mind:

- The first step in developing a strategy involves examination of conditions and opportunities in the subregional area/transportation corridor: existing jobs/housing relationships, affordable housing demand, characteristics of the resident labor pool. On request, ABAG will work with individual communities or groups of them in preparing this analysis.
- Because impacts of new employment growth in subregional areas are cumulative and the potential for affordable housing development varies from community to community, subregional cooperation will be needed, as well as actions by individual cities and counties.
- To maximize traffic mitigation through development decisions, jobs/housing balance measures should be coordinated closely with transportation strategies recommended by MTC.
- Reduced traffic impacts of bringing affordable housing into balance with job growth can only be realized over time. More immediate relief of congestion may be expected from maximizing employment of local residents in the new job opportunities.

### **1. Measures to Increase the Supply of Housing Close to Employment Centers**

Local governments throughout the Bay Area are enacting measures to encourage production of more housing (see Appendix B for summaries of questionnaire responses in I 680/ I 580 and Rte. 101 Peninsula Corridor

Studies). These measures, primarily enacted to meet Housing Element requirements, include:

- Rezone to permit higher residential densities near employment concentrations: in redevelopment areas, neighborhood and downtown centers, in industrial and office parks and commercial strips.
- Identify large, unused industrial, commercial and public lands with little potential for continuation in their current use and suitable for rezoning for higher density residential development.
- Provide incentives, such as tax exempt bond financing or density bonuses, to developers to encourage construction of multi-family housing near employment centers.
- Permit projects that mix residential and job-producing uses--in individual structures, in planned unit developments, in specific plans for redevelopment areas, and on large, unused industrial and public lands.
- Provide incentives for housing in mixed use developments, e.g. encouraging housing in commercial developments by reducing parking requirements, making restrictions on housing less stringent than in multi-family zones, such as increasing the allowable floor area ratio per lot or permitting higher buildings.
- Change zoning to permit such uses as restaurants, hotels and shops in industrial and office developments, thereby reducing overall employee densities and traffic.

Local development policies in most communities encourage additional residential development, but neighborhood opposition--to multi-family development in particular--inhibits implementation of higher density residential proposals in others. Many communities are examining their approval processes and development and design standards to try to respond to legitimate concerns of neighborhoods adjoining proposed multi-family apartments and other types of attached single-family housing. Actions that have proved effective include:

- Examine neighborhoods in substantially built out cities to determine where densities could be increased slightly without serious detriment to the surrounding community.
- Reduce additional parking requirements for second units when health, safety or neighborhood character would not be affected.
- Establish specific categories of uses or combinations of uses, e.g. planned unit development or mixed use designations, to ensure compatible development in transition areas between employment centers and surrounding low-density neighborhoods.

- Establish "pre-clearance" procedures, design standards and other measures for early identification of citizen and neighborhood group concerns about proposed multi-family, single-family attached, and mixed use developments in existing neighborhoods and on adjacent large, vacant or redevelopment area sites.

## 2. Measures to Encourage Production of Affordable Housing

First, as discussed in Chapter IV of this report, local governments need to identify the demand for affordable housing through measures to:

- Require sufficient information from developers on numbers and broad occupational categories of new workers in proposed industrial and commercial projects to estimate affordable housing demand resulting from anticipated job growth. On request, ABAG will assist communities in identifying housing demand by income levels for subregional areas.
- Consider estimated housing demand with local factors--prices of available sale and rental housing, vacancy rates, regional housing needs allocations, available land, existing affordable housing policies, zoning, and development regulations to determine how estimated needs of new households moving into the area compare with housing currently available or planned in nearby communities.

To promote production of housing affordable to new workers, many local governments in the corridor study areas have adopted measures to:

- Increase multi-family zoning in areas near employment centers.
- Add to the stock of affordable rental housing by permitting second units on already developed residential lots, or shared housing, or companion units within existing structures, where such slight increases in density do not seriously affect the neighborhood's character, stability and service capabilities.
- Encourage use of manufactured homes by identifying suitable sites. Some older cities, working with non-profit and private housing firms, have encouraged the use of manufactured homes to provide affordable ownership housing on infill sites.
- Consider development and design standards to ensure that higher density development is compatible with surrounding neighborhoods.

Local governments can offer incentives to encourage private investment in rental housing (Examples are from Appendix B):

- Offer density bonuses in exchange for maintaining a percentage of the units at affordable rents. Many cities specify a period of years (ranging from 10 to 30 years in the 101 Peninsula Corridor and from 5 to 15 years in the I 680/I 580 Corridor) for maintenance as rental units.

- Grant a subdivision map for condominium conversion at a later time in exchange for the builder maintaining the units as rentals for a specified number of years (Contra Costa County, Cities of Livermore, Pleasanton and Walnut Creek).
- Issue AB 665 mortgage revenue bonds, individually or with other jurisdictions, to reduce costs of construction financing for developers who build rental housing. Construction financing is provided to developers at below-market rates. The builder must rent 20% of the units for 20 years to low and moderate income households (Joint issuances: Cities in Alameda, Contra Costa and Santa Clara Counties).
- Facilitate joint ventures between non-profit housing development corporations and for-profit builders. In this arrangement, non-profit housing corporations, familiar with a community, can expedite the permit approval for the builder. In exchange, the builder sets aside a percentage of the units affordable to low- and moderate-income families (Cities in southern Alameda County and Eden Housing).
- Form interjurisdictional non-profit housing development corporations to increase low- and moderate-income housing (Diablo Valley Non-Profit Housing Development Corp.).
- Encourage individuals, businesses and corporations to contribute land to non-profit housing development corporations, thereby receiving a tax write-off.
- Offer fast-track processing for affordable housing (Walnut Creek, San Mateo County).

### **3. Measures to Phase Housing Construction with Job Growth**

To balance the intensity and rate of job growth with housing development, some local governments have adopted measures that:

- Limit the number of employees per acre, (through use permit conditions (Foster City) or at business license renewal (San Jose), or floor area ratios to limit building size (Palo Alto, Mountain View, Sunnyvale).
- Limit development according to existing street (Burlingame, Pleasanton), sewer (Livermore) and other service capacities, or to capacities of planned improvements with committed financing.
- Delay job growth until additional housing is produced.
- Limit allowable uses to those with low traffic volumes (Palo Alto).



- Require housing construction in tandem with job growth in redevelopment areas (Cities of San Mateo, Belmont, Concord).
- Provide development bonuses in office, industrial and commercial projects in exchange for the developer providing: 1) new housing within a project or elsewhere in the city (Cities of San Mateo, Walnut Creek); 2) rehabilitation of existing housing (City of San Mateo); or 3) contribution to a city housing production or loan fund, or to a non-profit housing corporation (Cities of San Mateo, Palo Alto, San Francisco).
- Establish an effective program for monitoring compliance.

#### **4. Measures to Improve Access to Transit for Home-to-Work Trips**

By involving local transit operators early in the design process for residential, commercial and industrial developments, and adopting design and structural standards, cities and counties can ensure that projects facilitate transit operations as well as public access to transit vehicles. To receive project approval, many cities require developers to build or contribute to some or all of the following:

- arterial or collector streets in residential subdivisions which are wide enough to accommodate buses;
- easy, safe, and direct pedestrian access from homes to transit stops;
- buildings oriented for easy access from transit stops to employment and shopping centers;
- bus turnouts for transit stops;
- intersections wide enough to accommodate bus turning ratios;
- streets with pavement durable enough to handle heavy buses;
- transit shelters at major employment centers or transfer points; and
- transportation systems management (TSM) programs (Pleasanton).

Some jurisdictions offer a planned development special permit allowing reduced parking, increased floor area, etc. for locations convenient to transit in central business districts (Cities of San Mateo, Palo Alto).

#### **5. Measures to Encourage Developers to Locate Where Affordable Housing is Available**

Analysis of jobs/housing relationships, as described in Chapter III, identifies sectors of a subregional study area with an excess of affordable housing over jobs. This reverse imbalance also contributes to traffic problems as residents commute to jobs outside the subregion

as well as to fast-growing employment centers within it. Communities in such sectors can work together and with Chambers of Commerce and public and private development corporations to encourage economic development and downtown revitalization through actions to:

- Identify sites available for office/commercial/industrial complexes that meet expansion needs of high tech and other light industries, particularly for production and assembly plants.
- Enact strong policy statements of commitment to take all steps within their jurisdictional authority and capability to:
  - o provide capital improvements and public services needed to complement job growth; and
  - o restructure land use policies and approval procedures to minimize costly delays.
- Provide information to private decision makers (including industrial developers and realtors) on sites, services, amenities, housing availability and commitment to provide needed facilities and to minimize project approval time.

## **6. Measures to Increase Employment of Local Residents in the New Jobs**

Few Bay Area jurisdictions have employed measures designed to fill new jobs with local residents--those now commuting out; secondary household workers entering or reentering the labor force; or local under- or unemployed persons. Before considering the measures described below, local decision makers would need to examine the characteristics of the local labor pool as discussed in Chapter IV. In other parts of the country, (see Appendix C) local governments and developers are trying approaches, either informally or through development agreements that:

- Require employers to advertise locally information about new job opportunities and skill requirements (Menlo Park, Pleasanton).
- In the EIR process, encourage voluntary agreements to give hiring preference to local residents as mitigation for job/housing imbalances resulting from the proposed project (Burlingame, Menlo Park, Contra Costa County).
- Make hiring preference for local residents or for trainees in local vocational programs a condition of receiving public assistance, e.g. tax breaks, write-downs and low-interest loans (Berkeley).
- Sponsor a job-screening and referral program for local residents and new employers.
- Encourage coordination among developers, employers and training institutions to improve the correspondence between emerging job

opportunities and training programs (Private Industry Councils (PICs) in northern Santa Clara County, East Contra Costa County, West Contra Costa County; West Valley Community College with electronics industry employers in Santa Clara County).

## VI. REFERENCES

- Association of Bay Area Governments, Projections 83, June, 1983.
- Association of Bay Area Governments, Projections 85, July, 1985.
- Association of Bay Area Governments, Projections 85 by Census Tract, August, 1985.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1980 Census of Population and Housing, Public Use - Microdata Sample. Hard copy produced by the ABAG Regional Data Center, Association of Bay Area Governments, 1985.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1980 Census of Population and Housing, Summary Tape Files 1 and 3. Hard copy produced by the ABAG Regional Data Center, Association of Bay Area Governments, 1982.



## APPENDIX A

### AFFORDABLE HOUSING DEMAND MODEL

Application to I 680/I 580 Corridor Communities

#### Memoranda:

January 17, 1985 - Salary Levels of Projected  
New Workers, 1985 to 1995

March 15, 1985 - Household Income Distribution  
of Projected New Workers



DATE: January 17, 1985

TO: I680/I580 Policy Steering Committee

FM: Yvonne San Jule, Patricia Perry, ABAG

RE: Salary Levels of Projected New Workers, 1985 to 1995

This is a revision of the December 10 memo to the I680/I580 Technical Advisory Committee entitled " Salary Levels of Projected New Workers, 1980 to 2000." Changes responding to comments received to date are noted in the text.

By encouraging affordable housing closer to new jobs, local governments can mitigate the traffic and air pollution impacts associated with new job-producing projects. Information about salary levels associated with proposed new jobs is not currently available to local decision makers. As a first step in helping localities determine what price/cost housing will be affordable to new workers, ABAG staff members have estimated the income distribution of new workers in the I680/I580 study area. If housing being built in the subregional area is more costly than workers can afford, cities may wish to reexamine the density mix and required characteristics of proposed residential developments.

This memo presents our preliminary findings about the income distribution of expected new workers in the study area by five major industrial sectors for the period 1985 to 1995. In the first memo we used the twenty year period from 1980 to 2000. The changing structure of the Bay Area's economy makes projections by industrial category unreliable beyond ten years. The number of new workers was derived from ABAG's projections data base. Data Base corrections made through September 1984 were incorporated in this analysis. Recent changes for the San Ramon Valley and Pleasanton areas, which will be used in traffic modelling, however, were not detailed to the macrosector level and have not been included.

Several assumptions were required for this part of the analysis:

- o the number of projected new jobs would be equal to the number of new workers;
- o the wage and salary distribution of new workers by macrosector would be similar to the distribution that existed in 1980; and
- o that the proportion of full-time and part-time workers would remain about the same as 1980.

ABAG staff members are projecting approximately 84,868 new jobs in the study area between 1985 and 1995. These jobs will be distributed by macrosector as shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Employment Projections by Macrosector\*  
I680/I580 Study Area

<u>Macrosector</u>	Projected 1985		Projected 1995		Increment 1985-1995	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>
Agriculture	3,543	1.6	3,589	1.2	46	0.1
Manufacturing/ Wholesale	30,399	14.1	50,701	16.9	20,302	23.9
Retail	51,090	23.7	71,887	23.9	20,797	24.5
Services	67,610	31.4	87,796	29.2	20,186	23.8
Other	63,036	29.2	86,573	28.8	23,537	27.7
Total	215,685	100.0	300,546	100.0	84,868	100.0

\* Derived from ABAG's Projections '83 data base.



The wage and salary distributions shown in Table 2 were used to project income. The distributions were derived from the 1980 Census Public Use Sample, a special file that permits users to crosstabulate data at the county level. In the first memo we calculated the distribution using 1980 data for Contra Costa County, since the data was not available at the study area level. In this version, we include the distribution for the nine Bay Area Counties for comparison.

At either the county or regional level, the data indicated very few workers employed at salary levels above \$40,000 in 1979 dollars.

Applying the Contra Costa County and Bay Area percentages from Table 2 to the numbers of incremental new workers by macrosector from Table 1, yielded the income distribution of new workers in 1979 dollars shown in Table 3. With the 1980 Contra Costa County distribution of new workers, 87.61% of the new jobs would have salaries below \$25,000; 97.5% below \$40,000. Comparable figures for the Bay Area are 86.51% under \$25,000; 96.8% under \$40,000. In this memo we have not converted wage and salary levels to 1984 dollars.

The next step in our analysis will be to estimate the housing demand created by the projected job growth in the study area, by converting jobs to households. We will need to make several assumptions to do this:

- o the same distribution of workers per household derived from the 1980 Public Use Sample will continue; and
- o the combinations of workers' salaries will be consistent with those that existed in Bay Area households in 1980.

While the analysis is based on a number of assumptions and the resulting estimates will be rough, it will provide, for the first time, the opportunity to look at the implications of proposed job growth for local housing markets. The information can be used by local planners and developers to vary the mix and densities of new residential projects, thereby enabling new workers to live closer to their job locations.

Table 2

Percentage Distribution of 1980 Workers  
by Wage and Salary Income at Place of Work  
for Contra Costa County and the Bay Area\*

Worker Wage and Salary Income 1979 Dollars	Ag/Min		Manufact/ Wholesale		Retail		Services		Other		Total	
	CC	BA	CC	BA	CC	BA	CC	BA	CC	BA	CC	BA
less than \$10,000	69.74	67.28	28.16	31.05	62.29	64.24	55.09	51.52	35.41	32.07	46.38	43.42
\$10,000 - 14,999	13.16	11.31	14.37	19.15	14.67	14.48	16.39	18.94	16.83	18.32	15.71	17.97
\$15,000 - 19,999	2.63	7.48	19.35	16.73	10.79	9.24	11.84	11.29	17.59	16.51	14.47	13.68
\$20,000 - 24,999	3.95	5.05	18.77	13.96	6.22	5.99	9.53	8.47	13.65	14.69	11.58	11.08
\$25,000 - 29,999	5.26	2.86	9.27	8.06	2.14	2.61	2.60	3.66	7.81	8.15	5.24	5.81
\$30,000 - 34,999	2.63	2.28	4.98	4.54	1.65	1.19	1.16	2.07	4.17	4.34	2.85	3.17
\$35,000 - 39,999	2.63	1.12	2.55	2.29	.29	.69	.87	1.19	1.59	2.03	1.28	1.61
\$40,000 - 44,999	.00	.73	.58	1.47	.58	.48	.58	.79	1.06	1.14	.71	1.00
\$45,000 - 49,999	.00	.39	.70	.77	.19	.21	.36	.42	.15	.61	.32	.53
\$50,000 +	.00	1.50	1.27	1.96	1.17	.87	1.59	1.66	1.74	2.13	1.46	1.73
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

\* Derived from 1980 Census Public Use Sample

Table 3

Projected New Workers by Wage and Salary Income 1985-1995

I680/I580 Study Area

Worker Wage and Salary Income 1979 Dollars	CC Distribution		BA Distribution	
	Projected New Workers	%	Projected New Workers	%
Less than \$10,000	38,158	44.96	37,645	44.36
\$10,000 - 14,999	13,245	15.61	15,040	17.72
\$15,000 - 19,999	12,703	14.97	11,487	13.53
\$20,000 - 24,999	10,242	12.07	9,249	10.90
\$25,000 - 29,999	4,692	5.53	4,838	5.70
\$30,000 - 34,999	2,571	3.03	2,609	3.07
\$35,000 - 39,999	1,129	1.33	1,326	1.56
\$40,000 - 44,999	605	.71	827	.97
\$45,000 - 49,999	290	.34	430	.51
\$50,000 +	1,232	1.45	1,418	1.67
Total	84,868	100.00	84,868	100.00





DATE: March 15, 1985

TO: I680/I580 Technical Advisory Committee

FROM: Yvonne San Jule, Patricia Perry, ABAG

RE: Household Income Distribution of Projected New Workers

Our memo of January 17, 1985, presented data about salary levels of projected new workers in the I680/I580 Corridor. Using a number of assumptions, we have now estimated the income distribution of new households that could result. In this memo, you will notice that the distribution of workers by income has been adjusted to include self-employment income.

Several simplifying assumptions were used in this analysis. They are presented below to help you understand the limitations of our analysis.

- 1) New workers will form households only with other new workers.
- 2) Workers within an income range, such as \$20,000 to \$24,999, are assumed to be evenly distributed within the range.
- 3) Within any income category (e.g., \$20,000 to \$24,999), the distribution of workers to households with one, two, three, or more workers was based upon the 1980 distribution for workers in the same income category.
- 4) Within any given class of households (e.g., households with two workers, three workers, etc.), the likelihood of any two or more workers being in a single household is independent of those workers' individual incomes. Instead, workers are assumed to form households totally randomly.
- 5) The cost-of-living index produced by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, can be used as an inflator for household and worker income despite any difference in the increases which have occurred in salary and self-employment income which might occur from one industrial sector to another.
- 6) Household income based only on wage and salary and self-employment income can be meaningfully compared to HUD's estimate of median household income.

### Methodology

By creating a special crosstabulation of Census data, we determined for 1980 how many workers in each income category formed households with zero, one, two, three or more other workers. This distribution was then applied to our projection of new workers by wage and salary and self-employment income. We then assumed that new workers would form households with other new workers according to the number of workers at each income level.

## Findings

Our earlier memo reported that ABAG was projecting 84,868 new jobs in the study area between 1985 and 1995. Table 1 shows how these workers would be distributed in households with other new workers if 1980 trends continued. This distribution yields an average of 1.56 workers per household.

Table 1

	Percent
1-worker households	53.8
2-worker households	38.1
3-worker households	6.4
4-worker households	1.5
5 or more-worker households	.2
Total	100.00

Using this distribution, crosstabulated by income, we estimate new workers 1985-1995 in the study area would form about 54,300 new households. The following hypothetical household income distribution would result. Numbers of workers and households are rounded to the nearest 100 to reflect the imprecision of our analysis.

Table 2

<u>Income in 1979</u>	<u>Adjustment using 8-84 CPI</u>	<u>Workers</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Households</u>	<u>%</u>
less than \$10,000	less than \$12,500	30,700	36	8,900	16
\$10,000-14,999	\$12,500-18,700	13,800	16	6,500	12
\$15,000-19,999	\$18,701-24,950	11,900	14	7,200	13
\$20,000-24,999	\$24,951-32,000	10,800	13	7,300	13
\$25,000-29,999	\$32,001-37,400	6,400	8	5,800	11
\$30,000-34,999	\$37,401-43,650	3,800	4	4,700	9
\$35,000-39,999	\$43,650-49,900	2,300	3	3,600	7
\$40,000-44,999	\$49,900-56,150	1,500	2	2,600	5
\$45,000-49,999	\$56,151-62,350	800	1	1,900	3
\$50,000+	\$63,350+	2,900	3	5,800	11
Total		84,900	100	54,300	100

## Comparison of Household Income Distribution to HUD Standards

As of 1984, HUD estimated that the median household income for the five-county Bay Area, was \$34,000. Households with an income of less than 120 percent of median income (\$40,800) were classified as "moderate income or less." Of the 54,300 estimated new households, about 70 percent would have a moderate or lower income. About 45 percent would have incomes less than 80 percent of median (27,200) which is classified by HUD as "low income."

Assuming that a household could afford to own housing no more expensive than three times its wage and salary income, 70 percent of the 54,300 new households would need housing costing less than \$125,000.

APPENDIX B

SUMMARIES OF HOUSING/JOB'S MITIGATION MEASURES  
SURVEYS

Route 101 Peninsula Corridor Study  
(June 1984)

I 680/I 580 Corridor Study  
(March 1985)





## QUESTIONNAIRE SUMMARY

### Rte. 101 Peninsula Corridor Study

This questionnaire was sent to 19 city and county planning directors in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties in April 1984. Responses reflect current policies as of May or June 1984.

## HIGHLIGHTS OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE ON HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT MITIGATION MEASURES

Responses were received from 12 cities in San Mateo County, from the County, and from 5 cities in Santa Clara County

### 1. Location of Residential Development

Fifteen of the 18 respondents have adopted or considered measures that increase the supply of housing close to employment centers. Twelve have rezoned lower density residential land near job centers to higher densities. In most instances the rezoning was proposed by the applicant. Seven jurisdictions have rezoned industrial or commercial land near new job centers to residential uses. One city commented that hazardous waste storage made housing inappropriate near many industrial uses. Fourteen jurisdictions permit mixed residential and job-producing uses and four have specific plans that combine high density residential and mixed use development on large, unused industrial and public lands. Palo Alto has commercial zoning providing incentives for housing.

### 2. Affordability

Seven corridor communities now require developers or employers to provide partial information about numbers of anticipated jobs by either broad occupational or industrial categories or income levels that would permit estimation of housing demand by income level or skills required for new job opportunities. Jurisdictions requiring this information related it to housing needs. Most respondents commented that this information is difficult to get because developments are speculative and tenants are not known. Eleven of 18 communities require developers to provide an estimated number of employees per square foot or per acre.

All jurisdictions have measures to increase the supply of affordable housing. Fifteen have high density residential zoning (over 20 dwelling units per acre); 14 permit second units in existing single-family homes. Other measures include shared housing (5) manufactured housing (8). Five cities use a variety of other measures. Fifteen communities have development and design standards to ensure that high density development is compatible with surrounding neighborhoods.

Incentives for private investment in rental housing are offered by 8 jurisdictions; 7 authorize mortgage revenue bonds to reduce construction financing costs for developers who build rental housing; 11 are involved in various interjurisdictional or joint public/private (for-profit or non-profit) approaches to providing affordable housing; and 5 cities offer a variety of other developer incentives.

### 3. Facilitating the Housing/Transit/Jobs Connection

Twelve cities invite transit operators to participate early in the planning process for residential, commercial and industrial developments. Several cities commented that transit agencies have limited staff resources available for reviewing planning documents. Palo Alto, Foster City and San Jose have comprehensive design specifications for improved bus operations, as well as for public access. The others have specifications for improved access only.

### 4. Phasing Housing Construction with Job Growth

Four cities regulate the intensity and rate of growth by limiting the number of employees per acre or floor area; 4 phase job growth with housing growth. Burlingame limits development according to existing road capacity and planned improvements. Palo Alto limits types of uses to those that have low traffic volumes in certain zones; Mountain View, Sunnyvale and Palo Alto limit floor area and allowable uses.

The cities of San Mateo and Palo Alto require developers or employers to add to the local housing supply, rehabilitate existing housing, or contribute to housing funds administered by the city as a condition of approval or a development bonus.

### 5. Employing Local Residents

Burlingame and Menlo Park have made hiring preference for local residents a condition of EIR approval. Menlo Park sometimes requires contractors on city projects to advertise and hire locally.

Coordination among developers, employers and training institutions is occurring at: Opportunities Industrialization Centers West (Menlo Park); West Valley College (Santa Clara) which ties classes to local employers' needs; and Sunnyvale, which coordinates with the Economic Development District, CETA and the Private Industry Council.

## CONCLUSIONS

Corridor communities, primarily because of Housing Element requirements, have taken a number of steps to increase the supply of housing close to employment centers and have enacted measures to encourage production of housing affordable to new workers. Few communities require information about job classifications in environmental documents at a level of detail that would enable them to examine the job growth implications for local housing and labor markets.





## ABAG QUESTIONNAIRE

### Housing and Employment Mitigation Measures

#### 1. Location of residential development

Has your city adopted or considered measures that increase the supply of housing close to employment centers? 15 yes      no

If yes, please check all that apply.

- 8 Has your city rezoned low density residential land near job centers to higher residential densities?

If so, was this action proposed by the city or the applicant?                     

city - 6; applicant - 1; both - 1

- 7 Has your city rezoned industrial or commercial land near job centers to residential uses?

- 14 Does your city allow projects that mix residential and job-producing uses?

- 4 Does your city have specific plans that combine high density residential and mixed use development on large, unused industrial and public lands?

- 4 Other? Please describe.

Daly City - overall residential densities (single and multiple family) are high reflecting proximity to San Francisco

Menlo Park - planned developments allowed on parcels of one or more acres along El Camino/SPRR corridor; after adoption of an area study, a residential/mixed use zone was created north of downtown

Palo Alto - commercial zoning provides incentives for housing: parking can be reduced, restrictions on housing are less stringent than in multiple family zones, height increases are allowed for mixed uses

Sunnyvale - comment: many industries have substantial hazardous materials storage inappropriate near residential uses

2. Affordability

- a. Does your city require developers to provide any of the following information during any part of the application process?

Please check all that apply.

4 Estimates of on-site workers by broad occupational categories (e.g. managerial, professional, clerical, service, production and crafts)?

5 Estimates of workers by industrial categories--if the tenant or tenants are known (e.g. retail, wholesale trade, manufacturing, transportation, business services, etc.)?

11 Estimated number of employees?  
per square foot?     yes     no  
or per acre?     yes     no

square feet - 4

shift - 1

acres - 2

building - 1

square feet and acres - 3

EIR - 1

2 Salary ranges of anticipated workers, if tenant is known?

2 Other? Please describe.

Belmont - city required estimates of on-site workers for one project only

Palo Alto - comment: most estimates are required only for projects over 50,000 square feet

- b. Please discuss any difficulties you may have had in obtaining this information.

Burlingame - applicants do not have firm data; they rely on their experience to estimate these numbers

Foster City - information regarding tenants of commercial/industrial buildings tends to be too broad

Menlo Park - information is impossible to determine for speculative projects

Mountain View - many proposed buildings do not yet have tenants

Palo Alto - estimates from developer often differ substantially from widely used averages

Redwood City - future tenants are usually unknown

San Mateo (city) - applicants do not always fill out forms completely if too much information is requested

Sunnyvale - most new commercial/industrial buildings will not be occupied by the builder

c. Do you relate this information to housing need? 8 yes      no

Belmont - City has only done this on one project

d. Does your city have any of the following measures to increase the supply of affordable housing?

Please check all that apply.

15 High density residential zoning (over 20 du per acre)?

14 Second units?

If so, what is the minimum allowable lot size?                     

2500 sq ft	- 1
5000	- 5
7000	- 2
7200	- 1
7500	- 1
9000	- 1
12000	- 1

5 Shared housing and companion units?

8 Manufactured homes?

5 Other? Please describe.

Foster City - Section 8, mortgage revenue bonds, tax increment financing

Palo Alto - city has a non-profit housing corporation to develop sites and a land-banking program

San Jose - discretionary alternative land use policies allow uses and densities greater than General Plan to encourage affordable owner and rental housing

San Mateo (city) - density bonuses for small units and for low and moderate income housing projects; reduced parking requirements for senior citizen projects

Santa Clara (city) - Mortgage Revenue Bonds

- e. Does your city have development and design standards to ensure that higher density development is compatible with surrounding neighborhoods? 15 yes      no

If yes, please describe.

Belmont - city has design review for new and rehabilitated buildings except single family homes  
Daly City - projects reviewed on a case-by-case basis  
Foster City - all high density projects go through planned development process  
Menlo Park - planning commission has adopted guidelines for the R-2 zoning district to address this; all R-3 projects require use permit and architectural control approval by planning commission  
Millbrae - new buildings other than single family residences subject to design review  
Mountain View - all projects receive site review and architectural review; area or neighborhood plans may have special conditions  
Palo Alto - architectural review board reviews all projects  
Redwood City - architectural approval required  
San Carlos - architectural review required  
San Jose - General Plan Policies on project aesthetics, privacy, security, landscaping, grading, sound attenuation, through traffic  
San Mateo (city) - site plan and architectural review requires that structure is in keeping with character of neighborhood  
San Mateo (county) - design review requirement exists in some of the larger unincorporated communities, in other areas zoning standards are used  
Santa Clara (city) - window placement to preserve privacy, masonry walls, landscape buffers, setbacks  
South San Francisco - commercial/industrial buildings approved by Design Review Board  
Sunnyvale - increased setbacks over one story

- f. Does your city offer any incentives for private investment in rental housing? 8 yes      no

If yes, check all that apply.

- 6 Density bonuses in exchange for maintaining a percentage of the units at affordable rents.

If so, for a period of how many years?           

San Mateo (city) - 30 years	Palo Alto - negotiable
San Mateo (county) - 10-20 years	San Jose - varies
Sunnyvale - 20 years	



4 Granting a subdivision map for condo conversion at a later time in exchange for a builder maintaining the units as rentals for a specified number of years?

5 Other? Please describe.

Daly City - reduction of off-street parking requirements for low income family or elderly housing projects

Foster City - city Community Development Department has developed a list of incentives to developers to enlarge production of affordable housing

Menlo Park - loan programs available through housing department

Palo Alto - city has not used these incentives yet but nothing to prevent it

Sunnyvale - rental projects must have 10% of units affordable to persons below 80% of median income; such building also receive a 15% density bonus

g. Does your city sell AB 665 mortgage revenue bonds to reduce costs of construction financing for developers who build rental housing? 7 yes     no

If yes, please describe.

Mountain View - currently reviewing an application which uses county program

Palo Alto - bonds issued as part of a county program

Redwood City - one project for the elderly has received tentative approval

San Mateo (city) - city authorizes bonds for low/moderate income housing

San Mateo (county) - county will be selling bonds for two rental projects through county HCD

Santa Clara (city) - bonds issued through a county program

Sunnyvale - bonds issued through a county program

h. Has your city considered any of the following approaches to producing affordable housing? 11 yes     no

If yes, please check all that apply.

5 Facilitating joint ventures between non-profit housing development corporations and for-profit builders?

4 Forming interjurisdictional non-profit housing development corporations to increase low- and moderate-income housing?

5 Joint issuance, with other jurisdictions, of mortgage revenue bonds?

4 Other? Please describe.

Belmont - city's redevelopment agency required by state law to include housing for low-moderate income households within project area

Foster City - city sells mortgage revenue bonds

Palo Alto - city has its own non-profit housing development corporation

San Mateo (county) - county uses CDBG money in a revolving loan fund for land acquisition and site improvements for affordable housing; county also grants density bonuses and uses fast-track processing to produce affordable housing

3. Facilitating the housing/transit/jobs connection

- a. Does your city involve transit operators early in the planning process for residential, commercial and industrial developments?  
12 yes      no

If yes, please check any of the following design specifications required by the city?

3 Arterial or collector streets in residential subdivisions wide enough to accomodate buses?

7 Pedestrian access to transit routes?

1 Orienting buildings so that transit riders do not have to cross parking lots or open fields, or go around planted areas to get to work?

6 Bus turnouts?

4 Intersections wide enough to accomodate bus turning ratios?

3 Streets with pavement durable enough to handle heavy buses?

7 Transit shelters at major employment centers or transfer points?

7 Other? Please describe.

Burlingame - transit planners have not responded; city has some transit access specifications

Daly City - in-house traffic specialist reviews all subdivisions and large projects

Menlo Park - city addressed this at the EIR and project approval stage and conditions are attached as appropriate; city has begun working with SamTrans directly

Mountain View - comments: city has invited Santa Clara County Transit officials to review plans and EIRs

Palo Alto - staff review of applications considers transit access

San Mateo (city) - planned development special permit allows reduced parking and increased floor area (CBD only) for locations close to public transit

South San Francisco - for specific projects, transportation management system plan (TSM) required

4. Phasing housing construction with job growth

- a. Does your city regulate the intensity and rate of job growth in any way? 6 yes \_\_\_no

If yes, please check all that apply.

4 Limit number of employees per acre.

If so, please describe how your city monitors compliance?

Foster City - applies use permit conditions

Mountain View - city limits building square footage and allowable uses

San Jose - at annual business license renewal

Sunnyvale - city has tried this and been unable to enforce compliance

4 Phase job growth with housing growth

3 Other? Please describe.

Burlingame - city limits development according to existing road capacity and planned improvements

Palo Alto - floor area ratios limit size of building; in some zones the city limits the types of uses to those that have low traffic volumes

Sunnyvale - city uses 35% floor area ratio to limit number of employees in industrial areas

- b. Does your city require developers or employers to add to the local housing supply as a condition of approval or a development bonus?

2 yes     no

If yes, please check all that apply.

- 1 Provision of new housing within a project or elsewhere in the community

San Mateo (city) through redevelopment agency

If so, is there any requirement that a percentage of the housing be reserved for low or moderate-income households?

1 yes     no

- 1 Rehabilitation of existing housing?

- 2 Contribution to housing funds administered by the city?

Palo Alto - projects over 50,000 square feet only

- 1 Contribution to a non-profit housing development corporation?  
(contributions of land to a non-profit corporation can be treated as a tax write-off)?

- 2 Other? Please describe.

Mountain View - comment: examination of experience in other cities indicates reducing permitted densities of job producing projects is more effective in easing the housing situation  
San Mateo (city) - CDBG monies used for land-banking

5. Employing local residents

- a. Has your city required any developer or employer to give preference to local residents in filling new jobs? 2 yes     no

If so, was this requirement:

- 0 A link between local job training program and hiring?
- 0 A condition of receiving public assistance (e.g. tax breaks, low interest loans, etc.)?
- 4 Other? Please describe.

Burlingame - hiring preference can be a condition of EIR approval;  
Foster City - comment: inquired as to legality  
Menlo Park - a condition of project approvals  
Mountain View - comment: unreasonable in Santa Clara County due to highly mixed job and employee residence patterns

- b. If you have any such arrangements, how does your city monitor compliance?

Burlingame - city relies on applicant's good faith effort for implementation  
Menlo Park - conditional development permits are reviewed by planning commission and planning staff

- c. Does your city have any programs for making information about new job opportunities and skill requirements available to local residents (e.g. requiring employers or developers to advertise locally)? 1 yes     no

If yes, please describe.

Menlo Park - city projects sometimes require contractors to advertise and hire locally

- d. Are you aware of any coordination among developers, employers and training institutions to improve correspondence between emerging job opportunities and training programs? 3 yes     no



If yes, please describe.

Menlo Park - Opportunities Industrial Centers West  
Santa Clara (city) - West Valley Community College ties electronics  
classes to local employers  
Sunnyvale - coordinates with EDD, CETA, Private Industry Council

If you have any questions about this survey, please call either:

Yvonne San Jule  
ABAG  
415-464-7953

Patricia Perry  
ABAG  
415-464-7937

## QUESTIONNAIRE SUMMARY

### I 680/I 580 Corridor Study

This questionnaire was completed by 17 city and county planning directors in Alameda and Contra Costa Counties. Responses reflect current policies as of December 1984.

TO: I680/I580 Technical Advisory Committee, Planning Directors in the Bay Area

FM: Yvonne San Jule, Patricia Perry

RE: Summary of Housing/Jobs Mitigation Measures Survey

DT: March 7, 1985

Last September, we circulated a questionnaire to seventeen Alameda and Contra Costa County planning directors to determine what housing- and jobs-related measures are in effect in the I680-580 corridor study area. Attached is a summary of the responses to that questionnaire. The questions that we asked were based on measures in use in the Bay Area and elsewhere which can reduce freeway congestion and shorten commutes by balancing new jobs and housing in communities experiencing rapid economic growth.

At the December 12, 1984 meeting, the results of the first steps of ABAG's analysis of projected job growth in the study area were presented. The results are in the form of tables and findings about income levels of projected new jobs. A second set of tables, about the expected number of households attributable to new workers and how they will be distributed by income will be presented at the March 26, 1985 meeting. Local planners can use this information to determine housing need by price/cost associated with the projected new jobs.

Responses to the questionnaire (see below) show that primarily because of Housing Element and other statutory requirements, corridor communities have acted to increase the supply of housing close to employment centers and have adopted measures to encourage production of housing affordable to new workers. Few jurisdictions, however, in approving proposed projects, have required that the applicant provide the information about job classifications of new workers that would enable them to match the type of housing that is being built locally to the housing needs of new workers.

The survey also revealed that measures to maximize employment of residents of the study areas -- employed residents now commuting out, new entrants or reentrants to the labor force, and local unemployed and underemployed workers -- are virtually untried.

The next step will be to begin discussions between the core staff for the study (MTC, ABAG, Caltrans, and representatives from public works and planning departments of Alameda and Contra Costa Counties) and a subcommittee of city planners from the two counties, to review 1) future employment and residential development implied by current local plans and the degree of jobs/housing imbalance, 2) the salary information produced in the analysis of projected job growth, 3) the list of potential mitigation measures upon which the questionnaire was based, and 4) the inventory of measures now in use in corridor communities. The purpose of the discussions will be to define a reasonable maximum mix of jobs/housing mitigation measures as one of the recommendations to be made by the study.

## SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE

Responses were received from all jurisdictions in the study area: from thirteen cities in Contra Costa County; three cities in Alameda County; and from the two counties.

In the questionnaire, mitigation measures which, by linking housing opportunities and new jobs, could help reduce impacts of new growth on the transportation system, were presented under five broad categories concerning:

- o the location of residential development
- o housing affordability
- o facilitating the housing/transit/jobs connection
- o phasing housing construction with job growth
- o employing local residents.

### The Location of Residential Development

Twelve of the seventeen respondents have adopted or are considering measures that increase the supply of housing close to employment centers. Eleven allow projects that mix residential and job-producing uses. Concord's Redevelopment Plan encourages high density residential development in the downtown; Lafayette's combination multiple family/office district has been modified to favor residential uses; Martinez provides tax-exempt bond financing for construction of multi-family housing along the office and R&D corridor. Antioch's General Plan has a goal of creating jobs/housing balance. Because the City's problem is a shortage of jobs, however, the City is emphasizing development of industrial parks.

### Housing Affordability

Few jurisdictions require information about estimated numbers of workers by broad industrial sectors or occupational categories in the project approval process, nor do many relate this kind of information to housing need in reviewing proposals. Three reported that such information was required to determine parking requirements or for transportation studies. All jurisdictions have, or will soon adopt, measures to increase the supply of affordable housing. Twelve have high residential zoning (over twenty dwelling units per acres; five allow forty or more units per acre in some cases).

Second units in single family houses are permitted by fifteen jurisdictions. Ten of these specify minimum lot sizes ranging from 5,000 to 10,000 square feet. Other measures include: shared housing (3); and manufactured housing (14). Four communities use a variety of other measures to increase the supply of affordable housing.

Fifteen jurisdictions have development and design standards (and a sixteenth is considering adoption) to ensure that higher density development is compatible with surrounding neighborhoods.

Incentives for private investment in rental housing are offered by nine jurisdictions; six offer density bonuses in exchange for maintaining a percentage of units at affordable rents. Minimum percentages of units and

the number of years the affordable rents must be maintained vary.

Five communities grant subdivision maps for condominium conversions at a later time in exchange for a builder maintaining the units as rentals for periods ranging from five to fifteen years.

Thirteen jurisdictions have authorized revenue bonds to reduce costs of construction financing for rental housing. Eight are involved in various inter-jurisdictional or joint public/private (for-profit or non-profit) approaches to providing affordable housing and nine jurisdictions listed a variety of other development incentives.

#### Facilitating the Housing/Transit/Jobs Connection

Twelve jurisdictions invite transit operators to participate in the planning process for residential, commercial and industrial developments; two at the advance planning stage; seven at project approval stage; and two, at both. Two thirds of the respondents have a full range of design specifications used in project evaluation for approved bus operations, as well as some requirements for public access.

#### Phasing Housing Construction with Job Growth

Four cities have regulations governing intensity and rate of job growth. Livermore regulates by limiting sewer hook-ups and Pleasanton limits development according to street capacity level-of-service maximums. Brentwood has regulations but intensity of development has not warranted application. Lafayette restricts office uses to certain zoning districts and favors commercial activities for reasons other than linking jobs to housing for reducing traffic congestion.

Only two jurisdictions require developers or employers in certain cases to add to the local housing supply as a condition of approval or a development bonus.

#### Employing Local Residents

One jurisdiction has made hiring preference for local residents a condition of receiving public assistance.

In Pleasanton, the AT&T Job Board and the Chamber of Commerce, in its annual job fair, make information about new job opportunities and skill requirements available to local residents.

Three cities cited the efforts of the Contra Costa County Private Industry Council (PIC) to improve the correspondence between emerging job opportunities and training programs.



## ABAG QUESTIONNAIRE

### Housing and Employment Mitigation Measures

#### 1.0 Location of residential development

- 1.1 Has your city adopted measures that increase the supply of housing close to employment centers? 12 yes 5 no

Comment:

Clayton - City has no employment center.

If yes, please check all that apply.

- 1.1.1 7 Has your city rezoned low density residential land near job centers to higher residential densities?

- 1.1.2 If so, was this action proposed by the city or the applicant? \_\_\_\_\_

Applicant = 2

City = 3

Both = 2

- 1.1.3 1 Has your city rezoned industrial or commercial land near job centers to residential uses?

- 1.1.4 11 Does your city allow projects that mix residential and job-producing uses?

- 1.1.5 4 Does your city have specific plans that combine high density residential and mixed use development on large, unused industrial and public lands?

- 1.1.6 4 Other? Please describe.

Antioch - City's General Plan has goal of creating a jobs/housing balance. The city's problem is a shortage of jobs, though, rather than housing. Consequently, the city is emphasizing development of industrial parks.

Concord - City's Redevelopment Plan encourages high-density residential development in the downtown.

Lafayette - Multiple family district zones have been modified to favor small parcels and reduce the need to assemble several parcels. City has also increased the allowable floor area per lot. Also, the combination multiple family/office district has been modified to favor residential uses.

Martinez - City provides tax-exempt bond financing for construction of multi-family housing along office, and R & D corridor.

2.0 Affordability

- 2.1 Does your city require developers to provide any of the following information during any part of the application process?

Comments:

Alameda County - County can require that more specific information be submitted at the subdivision or development stage.  
Clayton - Other than self employment, city has no employment base.  
Pleasanton - This information is not specifically required by the city except as part of an environmental assessment and individual business park CC & R design review procedures.

Please check all that apply.

- 2.1.1 11 Estimated number of employees?  
per square foot?      yes      no  
per acre?      yes      no  
other? (for example, per building, per shift, or per project)

Square Foot	= 4	Project	= 5
Acre	= 1	Per Use	= 1
Building	= 1	Varies by Application	= 1

- 2.1.2 1 Estimates of on-site workers by broad occupational categories (e.g. managerial, professional, clerical, service, production and crafts)?
- 2.1.3 0 Estimates of workers by industrial categories--if the tenant or tenants are known (e.g. retail, wholesale trade, manufacturing, transportation, business services, etc.)?
- 2.1.4 0 Salary ranges of anticipated workers, if tenant is known?
- 2.1.5 1 Other? Please describe.

Martinez - Employee data required to determine parking requirement.

Comments:

Moraga - This information is merely covered broadly in the EIR process.

- 2.2 Please discuss any difficulties you may have had in obtaining this information.

Alameda County - County has not had any difficulties.  
Brentwood - City has difficulty getting industry to locate in Brentwood.  
Concord - Future tenants of speculative projects are usually not known.  
Danville - Such information is normally not required unless needed for part of other studies such as traffic.  
Livermore - Most development proposals do not or cannot identify tenants.  
(continued on next page)

Martinez - Speculative developers do not know tenant mix beyond broad range or use types.  
Pleasanton - City has not had any problems; applicants have been cooperative.  
Walnut Creek - This information is not generally included in development applications.

2.3 How do you relate this information to housing need?

Alameda County - Total housing unit requirements of workers compared to total housing supply is not a real measure of match or lack of match between housing prices/costs and workers' incomes.  
Antioch - This has not been a problem yet.  
Clayton - Community is almost entirely residential, low density estates.  
Concord - No such analysis is done.  
Contra Costa County - It is considered in reviewing the development application.  
Danville - City includes such information in its new housing element.  
Lafayette - City only relates this information to parking need.  
Livermore - Planning department uses "average estimated workers" likely for project type.  
Martinez - No formal mechanism exists for relating such data to housing need.  
Pleasanton - City has no active comparison or study at this time  
Walnut Creek - City does not directly correlate this information to housing need.

2.4 Has your city adopted any of the following zoning provisions to increase the supply of affordable housing?

Please check all that apply.

2.4.1 12 High density residential zoning (over 20 dus/per acre)

2.4.2 If yes, do you allow 40 or more units per acre in any area?  
5 yes 7 no

Comments:

Antioch - City allows up to 25 dwelling units per acre in the downtown area as an incentive; otherwise, maximum is 20 dwellings units.  
Dublin - Draft General Plan includes high density zoning.  
Lafayette - Commercial zones allow residential uses with no density limit; however, a use permit is required.  
Pleasanton - Maximum of twenty-nine dwelling units per acre is allowed when the city grants a density bonus.

2.4.3 15 Second units?

2.4.4 If so, what is the minimum allowable lot size?

Alameda County - 5,000 square feet  
Antioch - 6,000 square feet (second unit cannot exceed 800 square feet)  
Brentwood - 10,000 square feet  
Clayton - 15 percent greater than zone minimum  
Concord - any residentially-zoned lot

Contra Costa County - 6,000 square feet  
 Danville - any R-1 lot  
 Dublin - 6,000 square feet  
 Lafayette - minimum size of zoning district; non-conforming smaller lot could not have a second unit  
 Livermore - 6,000 square feet  
 Martinez - second units can be built on any lot that conforms to setbacks, lot coverage, parking requirements, etc.  
 Pleasant Hill - no minimum lot size  
 Pleasanton - Minimum lot size R-1-6500 Zone  
 Walnut Creek - 8,000 square feet in single family districts; 6,000 square feet in duplex district; any size in multiple family districts

2.4.5 3 Shared housing and companion units?

Livermore - City encourages existing, non-profit effort.

2.4.6 14 Manufactured homes?

Martinez - Manufactured homes only allowed in designated areas.  
 Walnut Creek - Applicant must go through the Design Review Process.

2.4.7 4 Other? Please describe.

Danville - Density bonuses are granted for low-moderate income housing.  
 Martinez - Bond financing is also used.  
 San Ramon - City will adopt manufactured housing and second unit ordinances soon.  
 Walnut Creek - General Plan policy to fast track affordable housing.

2.5 Does your city have development and design standards to ensure that higher density development is compatible with surrounding neighborhoods? 15 yes 2 no

Comment:

Clayton - City is considering adding such standards to the General Plan.

2.5.1 If yes, please describe.

Alameda County - Standards include requirements for setbacks, parking, open space, height limits; also, an overall evaluation is conducted for planned unit developments.  
 Antioch - Traditional design review process on a project basis.  
 Brentwood - City has a design review process.  
 Concord - City has transitional setbacks, based on building height.  
 Contra Costa County - Zoning ordinance requires multi-family units within fifty feet of single family units be no higher than 50 feet.  
 Danville - Site plan and design review process exists at staff and Planning Commission level; review is based on written guidelines.  
 Lafayette - City has a design review requirement in addition to height, open space, landscaping, and setback regulations.  
 Livermore - Multi-family projects are subject to Design Review Committee approval.  
 Martinez - Planning Commission has a design review procedure.  
 Moraga - Design standards and a Design Review Board.



Pittsburg - City has an architectural review process.  
Pleasant Hill - City uses PUD approach to establish development and design standards for a concept plan which becomes the zoning.  
Pleasanton - Design Review Board considers applications on a case by case basis.  
San Ramon - City has height and setback restrictions.  
Walnut Creek - Standards are included in the city's Design Review Ordinance.

- 2.6 Does your city offer any incentives for private investment in rental housing? 9 yes 8 no

If yes, check all that apply.

Comment:

Brentwood - State law requires that the city consider such an exchange; however, the city has not received such a request.

- 2.6.1 6 Density bonuses in exchange for maintaining a percentage of the units at affordable rents.

- 2.6.2 If so, for a period of how many years? \_\_\_\_\_

Antioch - minimum of five years  
Contra Costa County - no criteria have been developed  
Concord - varies by project agreement  
Danville - varies by project  
Pleasant Hill - 10 years  
Walnut Creek - fifteen years

- 2.6.3 What minimum percentage of units is required? \_\_\_\_\_

Antioch - twenty-five percent  
Concord - Minimum percentage varies depending on qualifying income  
Danville - varies by project  
Pleasant Hill - ten to fifteen percent  
Walnut Creek - The number of bonus units is dependent on the density of the base project.

- 2.6.4 5 Granting a subdivision map for condominium conversion at a later time in exchange for a builder maintaining the units as rentals for a specified number of years.

Danville - This is being considered in the housing element; City has not yet determined the number of years units would continue as rentals.

- 2.6.5 If so, for a period of how many years? \_\_\_\_\_

Contra Costa County - ten years  
Livermore - ten years  
Pleasanton - seven years  
Walnut Creek - fifteen years



2.6.6 8 Other? Please describe.

Alameda County - Planning Department follows state requirements.

Antioch - City uses multi-family mortgage revenue bonds.

Clayton - City complies with state regulations.

Contra Costa County - County uses tax exempt financing.

Lafayette - City encourages small units.

Livermore - City participates in mortgage revenue bond program.

Martinez - City uses tax exempt bond-financing for multi-family housing.

Pleasanton - Growth management program allows density bonuses for affordable single family development, not specifically for rental housing.

2.7 Has your city adopted any of the following approaches to producing affordable housing?

Please check all that apply.

2.7.1 7 Facilitating joint ventures between non-profit housing development corporations and for-profit builders?

Danville - Concept is included in pending housing element draft.

Pleasant Hill - City is currently attempting such a joint venture.

Pleasanton - City has worked with the Pleasanton Housing Group.

2.7.2 5 Forming interjurisdictional non-profit housing development corporations to increase low- and moderate-income housing?

2.7.3 13 Authorized mortgage revenue bonds to reduce costs of construction financing for rental housing?

2.7.4 If yes, were these bonds issued in conjunction with another jurisdiction(s)? 10 yes 3 no

Martinez - Some bonds were issued with other jurisdictions; some were issued independently by the City.

2.7.5 3 Other? Please describe.

Contra Costa County - County uses CDBG and Housing Authority funds to provide supplemental gap financing.

Pleasanton - In cooperation with Suisun City, mortgage revenue bonds have been sold to finance purchase of single family dwellings and townhouses.

Walnut Creek - Single family mortgage revenue bonds in conjunction with the City of Concord.

3.0 Facilitating the housing/transit/jobs connection

3.1 Please check any of the following design specifications used by the city to evaluate proposed projects?

3.1.1 12 Arterial or collector streets in residential subdivisions wide enough to accommodate buses?

- 3.1.2 11 Pedestrian access to transit routes?
- 3.1.3 4 Orienting buildings so that transit riders do not have to cross parking lots or open fields, or go around planted areas to get to work?
- 3.1.4 11 Bus turnouts?
- 3.1.5 12 Intersections wide enough to accommodate bus-turning ratios?
- 3.1.6 10 Streets with pavement durable enough to handle heavy buses?
- 3.1.7 9 Transit shelters at major employment centers or transfer points?

**Alameda County - Transit shelters are the responsibility of AC Transit**

- 3.1.8 2 Other? Please describe.

**Pleasant Hill - City also checks proposed projects for benches by transit stops.**

**Pleasanton - North Pleasanton Assessment District; individual business parks such as Hacienda Business Park.**

- 3.2 Does your city involve transit operators in the planning process?  
12 yes 5 no

- 3.2.1 If so, does this occur most frequently at the advance planning stage or the project approval stage? \_\_\_\_\_

Advance Stage = 2  
Project Stage = 7  
Both = 3

**Contra Costa County - Transit operators are consulted during project approval or when an EIR is prepared.**

**Danville - Although this normally occurs at the project approval stage, it also can occur for a transportation study.**

**Livermore - City involves transit operators at both stages, but primarily project approval stage.**

- 4.0 Phasing housing construction with job growth

- 4.1 Does your city regulate the intensity and rate of job growth in any way? 4 yes 13 no

**Alameda County - County does not regulate; however, phasing of residential and industrial/commercial development in Las Positas and the Greenville Industrial Center has been considered.**

**Brentwood - General Plan addresses this and we potentially could regulate, however, intensity of development has not yet warranted any action.**

**Pleasanton - City regulates indirectly through the level of service maximums (TSM).**

4.1.1 If yes, please check all that apply.

4.1.2 0 Limit number of employees per acre.

4.1.3 0 Phase job growth with housing growth

4.1.4 4 Other? Please describe.

Brentwood - City's problem is excessive housing to jobs, not excessive jobs to housing.

Lafayette - We restrict office uses to certain zoning districts and favor commercial activities, but not for the reasons involved with this survey.

Livermore - Sewer hook-up limited to fifty percent of available capacity; remainder available to residential.

Pleasanton - TSM ordinance, street capacity limitations.

4.2 Do you find that applicants are complying with these restrictions?  
1 yes 3 no

Pleasanton - Information is not yet available.

4.3 Please describe how your city monitors compliance?

Livermore - City does not monitor compliance.

Pleasanton - City requires traffic studies as part of application review for incremental development; also, new TSM ordinance requires yearly updates and compliance review.

4.4 Does your city require developers or employers to add to the local housing supply as a condition of approval or a development bonus?  
2 yes 15 no

If yes, please check all that apply.

4.4.1 1 Provision of new housing within a project or elsewhere in the community

4.4.2 If so, is there any requirement that a percentage of the housing be reserved for low or moderate-income households?  
0 yes 1 no

4.4.3 If yes, what percentage? \_\_\_\_\_

4.4.4 0 Rehabilitation of existing housing?

4.4.5 0 Contribution to housing funds administered by the city?

4.4.6 0 Contribution to a non-profit housing development corporation? (contributions of land to a non-profit corporation can be treated as a tax write-off)?

4.4.7 1 Other? Please describe.

5.0 Employing local residents

5.1 Has your city required any developer or employer, as a condition of project approval, to give preference to local residents in filling new jobs? 1 yes 16 no

If so, was this requirement:

5.1.1 0 A link between local job training program and hiring?

5.1.2 1 A condition of receiving public assistance (e.g. tax breaks, low interest loans, etc.)?

5.1.3 0 Other? Please describe.

5.2 If you have any such arrangements, how does your city monitor compliance?

5.3 Does your city have any programs for making information about new job opportunities and skill requirements available to local residents (e.g. requiring employers or developers to advertise locally)? 1 yes 16 no

5.3.1 If yes, please describe.

**Pleasanton - AT & T job board; Chamber of Commerce annual job fairs**

5.4 Are you aware of any coordination among developers, employers and training institutions to improve the correspondence between emerging job opportunities and training programs? 3 yes 14 no

5.4.1 If yes, briefly describe the nature of the program.

**Antioch - Private Industry Council**

**Martinez - Private Industry Council**

**Pittsburg - There is a local CETA program**

If you have any questions about this survey, please call either:

Yvonne San Jule  
ABAG  
415-464-7953

Patricia Perry  
ABAG  
415-464-7937





## APPENDIX C

### EMPLOYING LOCAL RESIDENTS IN THE NEW JOBS



## **APPENDIX C**

### **EMPLOYING LOCAL RESIDENTS IN THE NEW JOBS**

Few Bay Area communities have used the development approval process to increase the number of local residents employed in the new job centers.

#### **Providing Information about New Job Opportunities**

In Pleasanton, the AT&T Job Board and the Chamber of Commerce annual job fairs make information about new job opportunities and skill requirements available to local residents. Menlo Park sometimes requires contractors for city projects to advertise and hire locally.

#### **Upgrading Skills to Match New Job Requirements**

Some coordination among developers, employers and training institutions is occurring through Private Industry Councils (PICs) throughout the region. West Valley Community College in Santa Clara County ties electronics classes to local employees.

#### **Preferential Hiring Agreements**

The City of Berkeley has recently concluded an agreement with a developer who will provide "first source" employment to individuals who are part of the City's on-the-job training program. Oakland is considering an agreement with an added clause that gives collective bargaining agreements primacy over first source provisions.

Strong, binding first source agreements are in effect in Boston, Portland and Minneapolis. The Boston ordinance requiring any contractor doing work for the City valued over \$50,000 to make a "good faith" effort to hire 50% Boston residents, was upheld by the Supreme Court in 1983. Camden, New Jersey has a similar ordinance, requiring 40%, that is being challenged by labor unions. Portland, Oregon's ordinance requires a hiring agreement as a condition of public development assistance, e.g., tax breaks, low interest loans and other assistance. Developers agree to use the City's Training and Employment Division as first source for new entry level job openings.

Fourteen large cities across the country have been developing programs under the Targeted Jobs Development Program, funded by HUD/EDA and four other Federal agencies.

The Rouse Company of Columbia, Maryland has less formal agreements on two large projects. In Baltimore, Maryland Rouse agreed to hire as many Baltimore residents as possible. The Mayor's Office of Manpower and Referral set up a screening and referral service for prospective merchants. Baltimore has similar agreements with the City's newer hotels. In the other Rouse development, in New York City, the Private Industry Council (PIC) and the Economic Capital Corporation (which administers the UDAG) provide the referral service.

Experience shows that a committed, experienced, well-functioning agency with good political support is necessary to convince employers the City can save them management time and expense.

Association of Bay Area Governments  
P.O. Box 2050  
Oakland, California 94604  
415/464-7900

#### PRINCIPAL RESEARCHERS

Yvonne San Jule	Planning Coordinator
Patricia R. Perry	Regional Planner

#### TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Ann Berry	Administrative Officer
Marci Loss	Office Manager
Carol Ratza	Administrative Secretary

#### ABAG EXECUTIVE STAFF

Revan A. F. Tranter	Executive Director
Eugene Y. Leong	Deputy Executive Director

The preparation of this report has been financed through a grant from the U.S. Department of Transportation, the Federal Highway Administration, and Urban Mass Transportation Administration, under the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, as amended.

Content of this report does not necessarily reflect the official views or policy of the U.S. Department of Transportation.





U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



C124890136

